



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

public schools would be stimulated. The teachers of the schools would have advantages which to-day they sadly lack, and that problem which is staring us in the face to-day and which has not yet been solved; namely, how are we to obtain a better class of primary teachers, would in great measure, I believe, be met. In the second place, that gulf which is now felt in education between the college and the public schools would be bridged, if not entirely, at least to some extent; the first steps would be taken. We know very well that any one expecting or hoping to teach in the college or university must be very careful that he does not allow himself to teach in the public school or get the name of having done so. On the other hand, a very small proportion of public school teachers have ever been inside of a college. If you talk with a public school superintendent, you will see that he is vastly more interested in the development of the normal school than of the college. They do not know much about the college and do not care to know much about it, possibly to their disadvantage. The college and school should be brought together. If our system of education is to succeed this must be brought about. In Germany the lower schools are connected with the higher schools much more closely than in America. If the college professor will work in connection with the superintendent of the public schools in the neighborhood where his college is to get the university extension movement started, I think that much will be done to remove this difficulty.

PROFESSOR A. MARSHALL ELLIOTT (Johns Hopkins University): I wish to state that DR. SWIFT wishes only to bring this matter before the Association this morning. We have no time to discuss it at present. In connection with the papers of this afternoon, there may be an opportunity to discuss it.

THE CHAIRMAN. We shall now resume the regular order of business, beginning with the reading of PROFESSOR KROEH's paper.

PROFESSOR CHARLES F. KROEH (Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N. J.), then presented a communication on

*7. Methods of Teaching Modern Languages.**

Discussion.—THE CHAIRMAN. It would be most impartial and impersonal on the part of the Chair to remind the Association, in advance of the discussion, of the flight of time. We have in addition to the discussion upon this paper, four papers to be read in two and one-half hours. I therefore take the liberty of reminding the Association that our discussions must necessarily be brief and the papers themselves must be abridged, so far as may be possible without doing grave injustice to the subject-matter. With these remarks, I take pleasure in inviting PROFESSOR VON JAGEMANN to open the discussion.

PROFESSOR H. C. G. VON JAGEMANN (Indiana University): It seems to me, Mr. President, that PROFESSOR KROEH has cut off discussion

*Cf. TRANSACTIONS in present volume for the full paper.

by the last sentence of his paper in which he advises us not to confine ourselves to any one system but to take the best found in the various systems of teaching which have been proposed. It seems to me that nearly all writers upon this subject make the mistake of over-estimating the importance of some one point in their teaching. I do not know that I have ever read a more interesting paper on the subject of methods than the paper of PROFESSOR HALE, of Cornell University, on the Art of Reading Latin. Yet it seems to me that PROFESSOR HALE made the same mistake of thinking that one little thing in the acquisition of a language was all that it was necessary to pay attention to, but I think that if we bear in mind that there are many different elements which enter into the acquisition of a language and that we must not over-estimate the value of any one, there is no doubt that each one would choose for himself that method which is best adapted to his students. No one student can learn a language by the same method as another, and no two teachers can teach a language by exactly the same methods. I think that for this reason a large amount of the writing and talk upon the subject of methods has been useless. Every one has to judge for himself and it is very difficult to advise anybody on the subject.

PROFESSOR L. A. STAEGER (Polytechnique Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.): I want to say only one word with reference to the different methods. I had occasion not long ago to write to MR. CHRISTERN, bookseller of New York, for certain books. In answer, I received a printed slip on which he said that the ROSENTHAL system was used in Germany and that what was in this system had been stolen from other writers. I therefore think that the name of ROSENTHAL, as applied to a system, does not merit our respect. In all other points I agree with PROFESSOR KROEH, especially in regard to the natural method.

PROFESSOR O. SEIDENSTICKER (University of Pennsylvania): I was pleased to hear PROFESSOR KROEH mention for how many different purposes a language may be learned. I believe that the purposes for which German is learned may be classed under two heads: the commercial use of German and its scientific use. I think that according to the purpose for which German is learned and the time that may be devoted to it, the method should be adopted. In order to master the principles of German with the view of understanding it in a comparatively short time, so short a time as is generally meted out to us in colleges and universities, I think that the shortest possible way should be adopted to put the pupil in possession of those analytical processes that are necessary to understand German.

If the object be merely to impart so much knowledge as may be required for speaking on ordinary topics of life, as PROFESSOR KROEH points out, I think that perhaps the natural method is the one which will answer best, especially if plenty of time is given, but if we have to wait until the student can understand in the language some of the rules required for analysis, too much time will be lost. I can say

from my own experience that I have occasionally had pupils who understood German, that is to say, they had learned German at home in much the same way as it is imparted by the natural method, in other words their parents spoke German and they were able to converse on the ordinary events and occurrences of life with tolerable fluency and correctness. When, however, we came to the analysis of more difficult passages as found in GOETHE'S 'Ephigenie' and in scientific language, they were at a disadvantage. Young Americans who had adopted the proper method of overcoming these difficulties by the ordinary grammatical method, would soon get the start of those who thought that they knew enough of the language to understand an ordinary book. I have found by experience that young Japanese students who labored under the double disadvantage of acquiring German through a foreign medium, would learn to understand German writers of considerable difficulty within a shorter time than those who came already furnished with a tolerable knowledge of German, but who had not gone through those mental processes for entering into the meaning of the more difficult words.—I believe that we should adapt our method to the purposes for which we teach and to the circumstances in which we teach. If we are given only a few hours a week, say from one to four hours a week during part of the year, we cannot impart so much knowledge by the natural method as to teach grammar in the language which the pupil is about to acquire.

PROFESSOR PAUL F. ROHRBACHER (Western University of Penna.): I was particularly struck with the last remark of PROFESSOR KROEN. I think that every sincere and capable teacher will make his own method. I regard cleverness of even higher importance than genius or capacity. A clever teacher will adopt those methods which will bear the best fruits. We have too great a multiplicity of studies and I have had students who found it impossible to prepare their lessons because they had so many other studies to attend to.—In speaking about cleverness and clever teachers, there is one fact to which I desire to call the attention of the Association, and it is that the clever teachers are not all confined to our own sex, but we find clever teachers in the other sex and some of them are in the midst of us and are members of our Association. I was at the meeting of the Association last year and I am here this year, but I have never seen one of these ladies placed on a committee or give her opinion on any question that came up.

THE CHAIRMAN: I must call the gentleman to order. We must limit the discussion to the narrowest bounds. There will be a time later when I shall listen with pleasure and in entire sympathy with the speaker, but I must insist that the speaker confine himself to the subject under discussion.

PROFESSOR ROHRBACHER: I would therefore conclude by requesting the Chairman to call upon MISS CARLA WENCKEBACH to express her views upon this subject.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that it would be improper and invidious for me to call upon any member who has not expressed a desire to take part in the discussion. I should, however, be glad to hear from any lady or any other member of the Association.

PROFESSOR C. SPRAGUE SMITH (Columbia College): I believe that we should first give the few principles necessary and apply them to the phenomena, and not give the student in any field of language any more than in anything else, the phenomena alone and let him discover the principles for himself. I think that there is a fallacy here, and I think that an error is made in the claims for the natural method based upon the assumption that the student must go into all the minutiae of grammar as was the rule in former times. I think that in the case of a bright student, the necessary grammar can be condensed into a few pages. In my own experience, I have found that all that I needed of the grammar could be condensed into two or three pages. These I could quickly grasp in a day and a half. Then starting out with the language, you bring the phenomena which are words back to the principles which you have already learned and this gives a rational basis on which to work. After you are familiar with ordinary words and expressions, you can go over the ground carefully and exhaustively and master the language.—Our object in studying languages in colleges is not to enable us to converse. That is impossible. What the student demands is the ability to read the language. That is the chief thing and it strikes me that by this method of giving them the main laws and then sending them out to collect the phenomena and compare them with the laws, we shall make true and rapid progress.

PROFESSOR CHARLES F. KROEH: My object in presenting a paper on elementary instruction in this way, was to enable the higher instruction of which we hear so much, to be carried out. This I consider the only philosophical way.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that the author is to be congratulated upon the specific influence of his paper. We have two sorts of methods of teaching, the natural and the unnatural methods. PROFESSOR KROEH seems to have made for the present time, at least, a happy family of us all.

PROFESSOR GUSTAF KARSTEN (Indiana University) next followed with a contribution on

8. *Speech Unities and their rôle in Sound Change and Phonetic Laws*.*

Discussion. PROFESSOR EDWARD S. SHELDON (Harvard University): One of course finds a certain amount of difficulty in discussing a paper like this which is somewhat technical, before so many members all of whom cannot be expected to be interested in phonetic study. For myself I do not hesitate to say that much expressed in this paper is so attractive to me that I can hardly resist the temptation to express a full agreement with some, at least, and indeed

*Cf. TRANSACTIONS in present volume for the full paper.